REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2002, the Examiner rejected all pending claims, namely Claims 1-20. The foregoing amendment amends Claims 1, 11 and 17, and adds new Claims 21-31.

In paragraph 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the MAX system. The Examiner relied upon three references that describe the MAX system. The Examiner referred to an article entitled "NYNEX Cuts Operational Costs in Forty Offices Using Expert System; Expert System Handles Telephone Troubles for NYNEX Customers" as Reference A. Reference A describes the MAX system as a system to "improve the handling of customer service problems, reduce the work load and lower operational costs." Reference A, lines 3-4. The MAX system "diagnoses problems with residential and small business telephone service." Reference A, lines 5-6. In particular, the MAX system is able to pinpoint the location of a problem so that the system "avoids dispatching telephone technicians on troubles that are in the customer's equipment, not in the telephone facility." Reference A, section 3. The MAX system analyzes troubles or reports of service problems by customers. Reference A, section 5. *See also* Reference C, section 1.

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 17 recite a service order. Although the Examiner has equated the troubles described by the MAX system references with a service order, a service order is distinguishable from a trouble. As described in the specification, there are generally two types of service orders, new installs and reinstalls/reconnects. Specification page 11, lines 35-36. In contrast, the troubles described by the MAX system references are not for the installation or reinstallation of service, but for the reporting of problems with telephone service. Thus, the MAX

system does not analyze a service order that is related to installation, as recited by Claims 1, 11, 17, 30 and 31.

The troubles described by the MAX system references do not include a dispatch. However, the Examiner has assumed that all troubles include a dispatch. There is no support in the references for the Examiner's assumption. The MAX system may avoid dispatching technicians on troubles that are in the customer's equipment rather than in the telephone facility, but the references do not describe that the MAX system creates a service order that indicates a dispatch is required or that generates a dispatch order, as recited by the claims. Thus, the claims are also distinguishable from the MAX system because the claims recite that a dispatch is cancelled, whereas the references describe that MAX system never generates a dispatch if the troubles are determined to be in the customer's equipment rather than in the telephone facility.

With respect to Claim 11, the Examiner alleged that the references describe that the MAX system receives service requests and generates service orders that include any necessary facility assignments. The cited sections of the references actually disclose that a maintenance center receives customer-reported telephone troubles and that the MAX system analyzes the received troubles. The cited sections do not describe the generation of a service order from a service request. Nor do the cited sections describe the assignment of any facilities.

As described above, the MAX system does not cancel a dispatch but avoids generating a dispatch. Thus, the references do not describe canceling or eliminating a dispatch as recited by the claims. In particular, Claim 17 recites eliminating the dispatch by correcting the service order and canceling a dispatch order for the dispatch. Claim 27 recites that the service order control system generates a corrected service order and the work management center determines whether the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order and if the corrected service order

corresponds to the dispatch order, then the work management center cancels the dispatch order. Claim 23 recites generating a corrected service order, determining whether the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order, and if the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order, then canceling the dispatch order. Even if the MAX system cancels a dispatch, the references do not describe the cancellation steps recited by the claims.

Claims 2-10 and 21-23 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-16 and 24-27 depend from independent Claim 11 and Claims 18-20 and 28-29 depend from independent Claim 17. The remarks made above in support of the independent claims are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references. The Examiner rejected some of the dependent claims, namely Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the MAX system references in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,619 to *Farris et al.* ("*Farris*"). The Examiner alleged that the MAX system references and *Farris* describe methods for reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. As discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 30 and 31, the MAX system references do not describe the assessment of a service order, as recited by the claims, or the assignment of facilities, as recited by the claims.

Farris is directed to improving provisioning services. In particular, *Farris* describes providing "an essentially no-flow paradigm where most service requests move directly from service negotiation to service activation without going through current largely unnecessary assignment processes." Column 13, lines 1-4. Although a by-product of the *Farris* system is that the existing connections to customer facilities for a particular customer location are maintained since it is likely another customer will move into the disconnected customer location in the near future thus eliminating the need to dispatch installers to install outside plant or office equipment

arg

facilities, *Farris* is not directed to canceling dispatches. *Farris* does not describe the generation of a service order related to installation that includes any necessary service facilities and the cancellation of a dispatch associated with such a service order, as recited by the claims.

There is no suggestion in *Farris* that its provisioning system would benefit from the MAX system. Nor is there a suggestion in the MAX system references that the MAX system would benefit from the use of the provisioning systems described by *Farris*. Thus, there is no motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Even if the references are combined, the combination does not describe the claimed invention.

arg

CONCLUSION

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. It is submitted that the claims are allowable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 815-6500
BellSouth File: 98041
KS File: 36968/211182 (19260-1800)

Version of Amendments with Markings to Show Changes Made

1. (Amended) A method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician when a service order that is related to installation and that includes any necessary facilities assignments indicates a dispatch is required, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch;

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary; and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then canceling a dispatch associated with the service order.

11. (Amended) A system for eliminating unnecessary dispatches, comprising:

a service order control system for receiving service requests from a source and for generating a service order that is related to installation and that includes any necessary facilities assignments;

a work management center for receiving the service order from the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch; and

a trap service order system for monitoring the service order generated by the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so, determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary by comparing a service order type and information in a selected field of the service order with a set of predefined criteria that indicate the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch.

17. (Amended) A method for eliminating a dispatch of a service technician specified by a service order that is related to installation and that includes any necessary facilities assignments which is unnecessary, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate a likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch by examining selected sections of the service order;

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary; and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then eliminating the dispatch by correcting the service order and canceling a dispatch order for the dispatch.